UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/52/211
25 June 1997

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fifty-second session
Item 27 of the preliminary list*

RETURN OR RESTITUTION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY TO THE COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN

Report of the Secretary-General

1. The question of restitution of works of art to countries that are victims of appropriation was first considered by the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session, in 1973, at the request of Zaire.[1] Its consideration thereafter in the Assembly is summarized in the report of the Secretary-General submitted to the Assembly at its fiftieth session (A/50/498). By its resolution 50/56 of 11 December 1995, the Assembly, inter alia, requested the Secretary-General, in cooperation with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), to submit to the Assembly, at its fifty-second session, a report on the implementation of the resolution.

2. The attached report, transmitted to the Secretary-General by the Director-General of UNESCO, is submitted pursuant to the above request.

Notes

[1] Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Annexes, agenda item 110, document A/9199.

* A/52/50.

97-17437 (E) 210797

/...

READEX Best copy available

ANNEX

Report of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on the action taken by the organization on the return of cultural property to the countries of origin or its restitution in case of illicit appropriation

1. Since the previous report by the Director-General, submitted to the General Assembly at its fiftieth session (A/50/498, annex), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has continued to promote the return of cultural property to its countries of origin as well as its restitution in case of illicit appropriation through the holding, in particular, of the ninth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in case of Illicit Appropriation (Paris, 16-19 September 1996),[1] which resulted in the adoption of eight recommendations (for the text of the recommendations see appendix I). The States parties to the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property are listed in appendix II. The present report summarizes the main topics raised at the ninth session of the Committee.

I. PROMOTION OF BILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS FOR THE RETURN OR RESTITUTION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY

2. The secretariat reported to the Committee on two cases pending before the Committee. With regard to the Parthenon Marbles, the observer for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland stated that the British Museum was independent of the Government and the Museum's statute limited the circumstances allowing disposal of any object in its collection. To permit the return of the Marbles, further legislation on the issue would be necessary because any confiscatory measure would be contrary to the British national legislation, as well as to obligations arising for the United Kingdom from international agreements, in particular to article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the European Convention on Human Rights. In conclusion, the United Kingdom observer underlined the position of his Government, namely that the Marbles should remain in the British Museum.

3. According to the observer for Greece, article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the European Convention on Human Rights should not be applicable to this particular case. He also informed the Committee that the new Acropolis Museum, which might exhibit the Marbles in the event of their return, should be completed by 2000. However, the return of the Marbles should not be dependent upon the completion of the Museum.

4. The Committee adopted by consensus Recommendation No. 1 on the matter, in which it invited the Director-General, inter alia, to continue his good offices to resolve the issue and to undertake, as a matter of priority, further discussions with both States.

5. Concerning the sphinx from Boguskoy, it was reported that informal bilateral talks between Germany and Turkey had recently taken place. Further discussions were planned.

6. Representatives of member States requested the assistance of the Committee on various issues, in particular the restitution from Iraq to Kuwait of a number of artworks still missing from Kuwait National Museum as well as the restitution of thousands of archaeological artefacts taken out of Iraq after the Gulf war. In response, the secretariat reported to the Committee on its actions to this end. With regard to the missing Iraqi artefacts, the Committee adopted Recommendation No. 7 in which it invited the Director-General to assist in tracing and returning such objects.

7. The Committee was also informed of a number of cases of successful international cooperation. The following examples were mentioned: the willingness of the United States of America to return objects from Prasat Phnom Rung, a stone monument in north-eastern Thailand; the forthcoming return to Bolivia from Canada of Bolivian textiles originating in Coroma; the assistance of the Netherlands in preventing the import of illegally exported Thai Buddha heads; Thai cooperation in the return to Cambodia of some illegally imported Cambodian art objects found in Thai antique shops; the return to Peru from Honduras of a number of artefacts; and the return of artefacts to Honduras from Costa Rica and Guatemala. Finally, the representative of the Republic of Korea informed the Committee of the policy of his Government of recuperating cultural treasures held abroad.

II. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION TO CURB ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN CULTURAL PROPERTY

8. In introducing the topic, the secretariat stressed the importance of appropriate training for various categories of professionals dealing with the issue of illicit traffic in cultural property such as law-enforcement officers, museum curators and civil servants. Since the eighth session of the Committee, the secretariat had organized a number of training activities, together with the International Council of Museums (ICOM) and other bodies, to familiarize national authorities with the most efficient ways of fighting illicit traffic in cultural property. Since the elaboration of the last report (A/50/498, annex), three seminars have taken place: at Bamako, for the countries of West Africa, in October 1994; at Cuenca, Ecuador, for the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, in September 1995; and at Kinshasa, for 11 Central African countries, in June 1996. A series of national workshops held in Cambodia for the protection of the Angkor site was also mentioned. A member of the secretariat pointed out that a publication entitled Preventing illicit traffic in cultural property: a resource handbook was being prepared to provide member States with a training manual.

9. The discussion revealed the importance which participants paid to training activities, the selection of participants and the appropriate follow-up. According to views expressed, training should not be oriented towards law-enforcement officers nor concern penal and suppressive aspects only, it should also focus on art dealers, museum curators, major auction houses and collectors

in art-importing nations, informing them of the plight of art-rich nations in preserving their cultural heritage. Within this context, the representative of Peru described the loss of cultural heritage caused by clandestine excavations and subsequent illicit traffic and requested the assistance of UNESCO in training law-enforcement officers in Peru. The Committee adopted Recommendation No. 2 with respect to training activities.

10. The representative of the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol) provided the Committee with details regarding Interpol activities in combating illicit traffic. They included publication and dissemination of notices of stolen cultural property based on the information received from the national central bureaus of the States members of Interpol, the organization of meetings for police officers and the development of a new international database on stolen cultural objects which, he said, would be operational by the end of 1996.

11. Several speakers underlined the need for closer coordination of activities related to the implementation of the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its Protocol, the 1970 UNESCO Convention on Illicit Traffic in Cultural Property and the 1972 UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage in order to harmonize the implementation of those agreements.

12. A member of the Committee reported on the efforts of his Government to establish an inventory of Ukrainian cultural objects dispersed during the Second World War that would be of assistance in locating and recuperating those objects. In that connection, he thanked the German authorities for returning 110 ancient books from the library of Metropolitan Flavian. The Committee Chairperson and the UNESCO secretariat were invited to the symposium to be held at Kiev in December 1996 concerning legal aspects and practice in the restitution of cultural property.

13. Another member of the Committee pointed out that, although some of her State's cultural property was held in many other States, it was not expected that such property might actually be returned. For this reason she was in favour of displaying such cultural objects through special exhibitions both in the current holding States as well as in the States of cultural origin to raise awareness.

14. An observer described the loss of cultural heritage resulting from the hostilities in Croatia, in particular from non-compliance with the provisions of the Hague Convention. The Croatian authorities were assessing war damages and compiling national inventories of stolen and missing cultural objects. A request for the return of cultural objects of Croatian origin from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was envisaged.

15. A representative of the United States spoke about the application of the 1970 Convention by the United States Customs and gave several recent examples of artefacts returned by the United States to Turkey. He also gave details on emergency export measures with regard to four countries of Latin America and the Caribbean (Bolivia, El Salvador, Guatemala and Peru) and one African country (Mali), which had reduced the flow of illicitly exported artefacts to the

United States market. A request by Nicaragua was being considered by the relevant United States authorities.

16. The representative of ICOM briefly described its main activities, in particular workshops on illicit traffic in cultural property and public relations activities such as the dissemination of information on art theft within the museum community. She reiterated the importance of inventories of movable cultural property and presented the 1996 ICOM publication entitled Handbook of standards: documenting African collections for the training of museum personnel. The Committee adopted Recommendation No. 8 in which it encouraged a wide distribution of the publication among member States and invited States of other areas to encourage the production of similar standard-setting publications.

17. Another important item discussed was the exchange of information between databases on stolen cultural property. The secretariat explained its activities to this end and informed the Committee that a meeting to discuss the technical aspects of exchanging information between existing databases, organized by UNESCO, the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic and the Getty Information Institute, was scheduled to take place at Prague in November 1996. In that connection, the representative of the Getty Information Institute underlined the need for some basic standardized form of information exchange on stolen cultural property and the importance of accurate information related to stolen objects. He went on to describe the results of preliminary survey on the subject. More than 500 organizations in 61 States had replied, including museums, police, customs services, experts in antiquities and art insurance specialists. This survey revealed an international consensus on the standard brief description required to identify a stolen object. Summing up, he underscored that only closer cooperation between private and public-sector organizations at both national and international levels might be successful in curbing illicit traffic.

18. The representative of UNIDROIT (International Institute for the Unification of Private Law) spoke briefly about the history and main points of the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects and mentioned that so far the Convention had been signed by 22 States. Of the members of the Committee, only Bolivia, Italy, the Netherlands and Peru were signatories, and she appealed to other members to join the agreement. UNIDROIT had begun setting up a database containing national legislation for the protection of cultural property, international conventions for the protection of cultural property, status of participation and a bibliography.

19. During the discussion on the UNIDROIT Convention, several States expressed their interest in the agreement and mentioned that they were considering joining it.

20. In accordance with Recommendation No. 3 adopted at the eighth Session of the Committee, on the establishment of an international fund to facilitate the restitution of stolen or illicitly exported cultural property, the secretariat reported to the Committee on its activities to that end. It became evident that three topics should be clarified: (a) the advisability of the creation of a fund; (b) the use of the fund once it was created; and (c) the source of

financing of the fund. Three possible uses of the fund had been discussed: transportation, insurance and reinstallation costs (such costs are usually minor and generally not controversial); compensation (a controversial issue); and legal fees (also a controversial issue).

21. The discussion on the fund revealed a wide variety of views. First, a question was raised as to who should be the contributors to the fund. Possible main contributors mentioned included States, private companies, organizations of ethnic minorities and philanthropic organizations or individuals. A number of participants pointed out that the fund should be provided with sufficient resources to be efficient. One participant suggested that the Director-General of UNESCO should create such a fund. Another question was how the assets of the fund should be used. Some participants favoured preventive and training measures, while others preferred to use the fund for overall expenses related to the return and restitution of cultural objects. A third question was whether the creation of the fund should not be preceded by the creation of national funds which might attract donations if the donors were given some tax exemptions, as in the case of some United States foundations active in that area. In that connection, an observer proposed considering the possibilities for creating: both an international fund and national funds, which would leave donors free to choose among activities to finance. He gave the example of the UNESCO International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC), from the Special Fund of which member States could choose particular cases and activities to support within the Fund's limited sources. The discussion resulted in the adoption of Recommendation No. 5, in which the Committee invited the Director-General to seek further information from member States on the matter.

22. Further to the adoption of Recommendation No. 5 adopted at the eighth session, on an international code of ethics for dealers in cultural property, the consultant who prepared the feasibility study (see A/50/498, annex, para. 28) gave an update on the topic. He had discussed the issue widely with a number of art dealers and had not received any adverse reaction. He concluded by suggesting that the Committee adopt the code of ethics as an official UNESCO Code in order to enhance ethical standards in art trade.

23. Several participants stressed that such a code might be a complementary tool in the implementation of the UNIDROIT Convention, in particular with respect to provision of article 4, paragraph 1, related to the good-faith possessor. The fact that the purchaser acquired a cultural object from an art dealer bound by the Code could be a proof of due diligence in case of theft and, therefore, the purchaser should be entitled to fair and reasonable compensation.

24. Some participants expressed doubts as to the character of the Code which was a non-binding instrument and, therefore, could not be enforced. One member of the Committee pointed out that her country already had a code of ethics for dealers. Another observer questioned the effectiveness of such a code without the endorsement of the dealers who would actually use it. The Chairperson agreed with this view and suggested that further consultations should take place. The Committee adopted Recommendation No. 6 in which it recommended that the Director-General seek the views of UNESCO member States and States parties to the 1970 Convention concerning the Code.

25. In accordance with paragraph 5 of Recommendation 5 of the eighth session, on specialized studies on art trade, the Director-General had commissioned a study on the issue. Following discussions with various art dealers and their professional groups, the consultant emphasized that in most cases of illicit traffic, the provenance of the antiquities was unknown. Most antiquities which appeared on the free market were likely to originate from clandestine excavations. He concluded by suggesting that the Committee should commission an investigative study on illegal traffic in cultural property by a professional investigative journalist to gain a clear understanding of the scale of the problem. Furthermore, such a study should be published.

26. One observer stressed the need to evaluate critically the work of the secretariat in the light of the limited financial and human resources available. It was necessary to assess what should and could be done by the Committee and its secretariat.

III. PUBLIC INFORMATION

27. A number of participants underscored the necessity of raising the awareness of art dealers, auction houses, gallery owners and collectors to curb illicit traffic in cultural property. One participant mentioned the importance of using existing mass media such as radio and television to remind citizens of the consequences of the problem and suggested that a film on the issue should be produced by the Committee, if extrabudgetary resources were available. Information campaigns should target potential buyers in "art-importing" countries so that they might avoid buying artefacts of dubious origin.

28. Mention was made of the potential use of the Internet for locating stolen and/or missing cultural objects. The representative of France informed the Committee that the French authorities intended to put on the Internet information on cultural property currently held in French museums whose owners were unknown and which had never been claimed.

Notes

[1] Further to resolution 28 C/22, adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its twenty-eighth session (Paris, October/November 1995), the Intergovernmental Committee is now composed of 22 member States instead of 20. The ninth session was attended by all Committee members (Bangladesh, Bolivia, Cameroon, Canada, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Italy, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Myanmar, Netherlands, Peru, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, Togo, Ukraine and Zaire).

APPENDIX I

[Original: English/French]

Recommendations adopted by the Intergovernmental Committee at its ninth session, held in Paris from 16 to 19 September 1996

Recommendation No. 1

[Original: English]

The Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in case of Illicit Appropriation,

Recalling the request of Greece to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the return of the marbles from the Parthenon held in the British Museum,

Noting the recommendation adopted in 1982 at the UNESCO World Conference on Cultural Policies in Mexico, "considering it right and just that these marbles be returned to Greece",

Recalling the previous recommendations adopted by the Committee on this question,

Aware of the continuing concern of the Greek authorities for the resolution of this claim,

Noting the legal and cultural arguments which have been made by both States concerned over a number of years,

Recognizing the efforts of the Director-General to ensure that dialogue continues,

1. Invites the Director-General to continue his good offices to resolve this issue and to undertake, as a matter of priority, further discussions with both States;

2. Further invites the Director-General to report to the Committee at its tenth session on the result of these discussions."

Recommendation No. 2

[Original: French]

The Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in case of Illicit Appropriation,

Emphasizing the encouraging results of the regional and national training activities established by UNESCO, in cooperation with the national and international institutions concerned, to improve the implementation of the 1970 Convention on illicit traffic in cultural property,

Noting the announcement made by the secretariat of the forthcoming publication of a practical handbook designed for national officials to facilitate the implementation of the 1970 Convention,

1. Invites the Director-General to reinforce the resources available for the development of such training programmes, especially those designed for national officials and, in particular, customs officers and police;

2. Also invites the Director-General to Cooperate closely with member States with a view to the establishment at the national level of projects designed to develop measures over the whole area of protection of cultural property against illicit trafficking, including not only internal measures of protection but also the necessary activities of international cooperation;

3. Further invites the Director-General to facilitate the participation of trainees from countries which are victims of illicit traffic in the activities of the secretariat to combat this traffic;

4. Invites the Director-General to reinforce activities directed to the follow-up of recommendations adopted in the course of the regional training activities already organized;

5. Appeals to member States to reinforce their support to training activities in this field, as well as to appropriate activity for the information and sensitization of the public, especially by radio, television and film;

6. Invites the Director-General to seek out extrabudgetary resources to complement the budget of the regular programme of UNESCO in this field.

Recommendation No. 3

[Original: English]

The Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in case of Illicit Appropriation,

Recalling that in accordance with article 4, paragraph 1, of the statute the Committee is responsible for seeking ways and means of facilitating bilateral negotiations for the restitution or return of cultural property to its countries of origin,

Recalling further that article 17, paragraph 5, of the 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property provides the secretariat with the possibility

of offering its good offices in the case of a dispute of two or more States parties over the implementation of the Convention,

Reiterating the role of the Committee as an international forum for negotiation which has assisted in finding acceptable solutions for countries trying to repatriate their cultural property,

1. Encourages all States members of UNESCO to make use of the Committee's good offices in settling international claims for the restitution or return of cultural property;

2. Invites all States members of UNESCO to disseminate widely within their respective countries information with regard to the Committee's main aims and purposes.

Recommendation No. 4

[Original: French]

The Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in case of Illicit Appropriation,

Learning with satisfaction of the activities of cooperation undertaken in Cambodia by UNESCO to protect cultural property at the site of Angkor against illicit acts such as theft and pillage,

1. Invites the Director-General to undertake as a priority other such initiatives making use of possible synergies between the application of the various Conventions on the protection of the heritage (of 1954, 1970 and 1972) which require coordinated and complementary action by the different services of the secretariat and the different institutions concerned such as ICCROM, IDLI, Interpol, IUCN, UNIDROIT, ICOM, ICOMOS, etc.;

2. Also invites the Director-General, taking into consideration the most highly developed experience in each of the areas concerned in the application of the 1970 Convention (training of officials, security, inventories, suppression of illicit activities, information and education of the public), to fully utilize the potential of cooperation between all the member States.

Recommendation No. 5

[Original: English]

The Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in case of Illicit Appropriation,

Referring to Recommendation No. 3 of the Committee's eighth session, in which the Committee invited the Director-General to examine the possibility of

establishing an international fund intended to facilitate the restitution of stolen or illicitly exported cultural objects in cases where the countries concerned are unable to meet the related financial costs,

Conscious of the need to decide on the establishment of such a fund at the Committee's tenth session,

1. Invites the Director-General to distribute to all States members of UNESCO the secretariat's report on this matter, including comments made by the members of the Committee at its ninth session;

2. Also invites the Director-General to request all States members of UNESCO to forward to the secretariat, within twelve months of this request, comments on the report of the secretariat;

3. Further invites the Director-General to include an item on the fund in the agenda of the tenth session of the Committee.

Recommendation No. 6

[Original: French]

The Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries or Origin or its Restitution in case of Illicit Appropriation,

Recalling that in Recommendation No. 5 of its eighth session the Committee invited the Director-General to include an item on an international code of ethics for dealers in the agenda of the ninth session of the Committee,

Convinced that such a code would contribute to the elimination of illicitly trafficked cultural objects from the licit trade, harmonize practice throughout the world and provide guidance in ambiguous situations,

Noting that the Code of Professional Ethics adopted under the auspices of the International Council of Museums, has had a major impact on the attitudes of the international museum community,

Persuaded that the "Draft International Code of Ethics for Dealers in Cultural Property" supplements the provisions of the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property and would contribute to the better implementation of article 5(e) of the Convention,

Recommends that the Director-General invite States members of UNESCO and States parties to the 1970 Convention to express their views on the code in order to prepare a report to be submitted to the twenty-ninth session of the General Conference.

Recommendation No. 7

[Original: English]

The Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in case of Illicit Appropriation

Invites the Director-General to do his utmost to help in the tracing and return of the cultural and archaeological properties stolen and smuggled from Iraq.

Recommendation No. 8

[Original: French]

The Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in case of Illicit Appropriation,

Emphasizing the importance of the handbook of standards for the documentation of African collections both for facilitating the establishment of national inventories and for the training of national staff,

Likewise emphasizing the importance of the handbook for cooperation between States, museums and other institutions concerned in the struggle against illicit traffic,

1. Congratulates the International Council of Museums on the development of the handbook;

2. Invites the Director-General, in collaboration with the Council, to ensure a broad distribution among member States;

3. Invites African States to use the handbook of standards to develop inventories of cultural property;

4. Invites States of other areas of the world to encourage the production of similar standard-making publications;

5. Reaffirms the necessity for all States victims of illicit traffic in cultural property to make or update systematic inventories of movable cultural property so as to secure its better protection;

6. Recommends that the Director-General and the member States concerned take account of the experience of other member States as regards inventories of cultural property, whether at the national level or in their cooperation with other States.

APPENDIX II

List of the 86 States parties to the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property as at 8 January 1997

(Paris, 14 November 1970)

States	Date of deposit Ratification (R) Acceptance (Ac) Accession (A) Succession (S)	Date of entry into force
Algeria	24 June 1974 (R)	24 September 1974
Angola	7 November 1991 (R)	7 February 1992
Argentina	11 January 1973 (R)	11 April 1973
Armenia[a]	5 September 1993 (S)	See note [a]
Australia	30 October 1989 (Ac)	30 January 1990
Bangladesh	9 December 1987 (R)	9 March 1988
Belarus	28 April 1988 (R)	28 July 1988
Belize	26 January 1990 (R)	26 April 1990
Bolivia	4 October 1976 (R)	4 January 1977
Bosnia and Herzegovina[b]	12 July 1993 (S)	See note [b]
Brazil	16 February 1973 (R)	16 May 1973
Bulgaria[c]	15 September 1971 (R)	24 April 1972
Burkina Faso	7 April 1987 (R)	7 July 1987
Cambodia	26 September 1972 (R)	26 December 1972
Cameroon	24 May 1972 (R)	24 August 1972
Canada	28 March 1978 (Ac)	28 June 1978
Central African Republic	1 February 1972 (R)	1 May 1972

States	Date of deposit Ratification (R) Acceptance (Ac) Accession (A) Succession (S)	Date of entry into force
China	28 November 1989 (Ac)	28 February 1990
Colombia	24 May 1988 (Ac)	24 August 1988
Costa Rica	6 March 1996 (R)	6 June 1996
Côte d'Ivoire	30 October 1990 (R)	30 January 1991
Croatia[b]	6 July 1992 (S)	See note [b]
Cuba	30 January 1980 (R)	30 April 1980
Cyprus	19 October 1979 (R)	19 January 1980
Czech Republic[c]	26 March 1993 (S)	See note [c]
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	13 May 1983 (R)	13 August 1983
Dominican Republic	7 March 1973 (R)	7 June 1973
Ecuador[e]	24 March 1971 (Ac)	24 April 1972
Egypt	5 April 1973 (Ac)	5 July 1973
El Salvador	20 February 1978 (R)	20 May 1978
Estonia	27 October 1995 (R)	27 January 1996
France	7 January 1997 (R)	7 April 1997
Georgia[a]	4 May 1992 (S)	See note [a]
Greece	5 June 1981 (R)	5 September 1981
Grenada	10 September 1992 (Ac)	10 December 1992
Guatemala	14 January 1985 (R)	14 April 1985
Guinea	18 March 1979 (R)	18 June 1979
Honduras	19 March 1979 (R)	19 June 1979

States	Date of deposit Ratification (R) Acceptance (Ac) Accession (A) Succession (S)	Date of entry into force
Hungary	23 October 1978 (R)	23 January 1979
India	24 January 1977 (R)	24 April 1977
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	27 January 1975 (Ac)	27 April 1975
Iraq	12 February 1973 (Ac)	12 May 1973
Italy	2 October 1978 (R)	2 January 1979
Jordan	15 March 1974 (R)	15 June 1974
Kuwait	22 June 1972 (Ac)	22 September 1972
Kyrgyzstan	3 July 1995 (A)	3 October 1995
Lebanon	25 August 1992 (R)	25 November 1992
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	9 January 1973 (R)	9 April 1973
Madagascar	21 June 1989 (R)	21 September 1989
Mali	6 April 1987 (R)	6 July 1987
Mauritania	27 April 1977 (R)	27 July 1977
Mauritius	27 February 1978 (Ac)	27 May 1978
Mexico	4 October 1972 (Ac)	4 January 1973
Mongolia	23 May 1991 (Ac)	23 August 1991
Nepal	23 June 1976 (R)	23 September 1976
Nicaragua	19 April 1977 (R)	19 July 1977
Niger	16 October 1972 (R)	16 January 1973
Nigeria	24 January 1972 (R)	24 April 1972
Oman	2 June 1978 (Ac)	2 September 1978
Pakistan	30 April 1981 (R)	30 July 1981

/...

States	Date of deposit Ratification (R) Acceptance (Ac) Accession (A) Succession (S)	Date of entry into force
Panama	13 August 1973 (Ac)	13 November 1973
Peru	24 October 1979 (Ac)	24 January 1980
Poland	31 January 1974 (R)	30 April 1974
Portugal	9 December 1985 (R)	9 March 1986
Qatar	20 April 1977 (Ac)	20 July 1977
Republic of Korea	14 February 1983 (Ac)	14 May 1983
Romania	6 December 1993 (R)	6 March 1994
Russian Federation[d]	28 April 1988 (R)	28 July 1988
Saudi Arabia	8 September 1976 (Ac)	8 December 1976
Senegal	9 December 1984 (R)	9 March 1985
Slovakia[c]	31 March 1993 (S)	See note [c]
Slovenia[b]	5 November 1992 (S)	See note [b]
Spain	10 January 1986 (R)	10 April 1986
Sri Lanka	7 April 1981 (Ac)	7 July 1981
Syrian Arab Republic	21 February 1975 (Ac)	21 May 1975
Tajikistan[a]	28 June 1992 (S)	See note [a]
Tunisia	10 March 1975 (R)	10 June 1975
Turkey	21 April 1981 (R)	21 July 1981
Ukraine	28 April 1988 (R)	28 July 1988
United Republic of Tanzania	2 August 1977 (R)	2 November 1977
United States of America	2 September 1983 (Ac)	2 December 1983

States	Date of deposit Ratification (R) Acceptance (Ac) Accession (A) Succession (S)	Date of entry into force
Uruguay	9 August 1977 (R)	9 November 1977
Uzbekistan	15 March 1996 (R)	15 June 1996
Yugoslavia	3 October 1972 (R)	3 January 1973
Zaire	23 September 1974 (R)	23 December 1974
Zambia	21 June 1985 (R)	21 September 1985

[a] On the date mentioned, this State lodged a notification of succession by which it stated that it was bound by the Convention that the USSR had ratified on 28 April 1988.

[b] On the date mentioned, this State lodged a notification of succession by which it stated that it was bound by the Convention which Yugoslavia had ratified on 3 October 1972.

[c] On the date mentioned, this State lodged a notification of succession by which it stated that it was bound by the Convention which Czechoslovakia had accepted on 14 February 1977.

[d] The instrument of ratification was deposited by the USSR on 28 April 1988. The Director-General has been informed that the Russian Federation would continue the participation of the USSR in UNESCO Conventions.

[e] In conformity with the procedure set forth in the Convention, this agreement entered into force, for the first States, three months after the deposit of ratification by the third State, Nigeria.